

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

**JEFFREY FREEMAN,**

Plaintiff,

vs.

**INDOCHINO APPAREL, INC., ET AL.,**

Defendants.

CASE No. 19-cv-04539-YGR

**ORDER DENYING MOTION TO DISMISS  
FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT; SETTING  
CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE**

Re: Dkt. No. 37

Defendants Indochino Apparel Inc., Indochino Apparel (US), Inc. (collectively “Indochino”) sell made-to-measure clothing such as suits, tuxedos, blazers, vests and pants. Plaintiff Jeffrey Freeman brings this consumer class action alleging that defendants engaged in a systematic and pervasive false reference pricing scheme by deceptively advertising through their website, in stores, via e-mails and on social media that their clothing was “on sale” and was previously sold at a substantially higher price when, in fact, the clothing was always sold at or near the falsely claimed “sale” price.

Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint, filed December 18, 2019 (Dkt. No. 35, “FAC”), alleges he bought a custom, made-to-measure suit from Indochino on August 4, 2017, in its San Francisco showroom location. Plaintiff claims he viewed the suit’s pricing on Indochino’s website as well as when he visited its showroom. Plaintiff alleges he was injured by Indochino’s use of “reference pricing.” Plaintiff alleges Indochino’s clothing was regularly and repeatedly advertised at substantial discounts to a specified reference price but rarely, if ever, sold at the represented reference price. Plaintiff alleges claims for violations of the California Consumer Legal Remedies Act (“CLRA,” Cal. Civil Code § 1750 *et seq.*); California False Advertising Law (“FAL,” Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17500 *et seq.*); and California’s Unfair Competition Law (“UCL,” Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 *et seq.*), as well as claims for breach of contract; and unjust enrichment.

1 Indochino moves to dismiss on several grounds: (1) insufficient pre-suit notice with  
2 respect to Freeman's CLRA and contract claims; (2) failure to allege plausible claims under the  
3 UCL, FAL or CLRA; (3) failure to plead a plausible breach of contract claim; (4) failure to allege  
4 a basis for and standing to pursue equitable relief; and (5) failure to allege a basis for punitive  
5 damages. The Court, having considered carefully the papers<sup>1</sup> and pleadings filed in support of and  
6 in opposition to the motion, **DENIES** the motion to dismiss.

## 7 | I. DISCUSSION

## 8 || A. Pre-Suit Notice

9 Indochino moves to dismiss the CLRA and breach of contract claims on the grounds that  
10 plaintiff failed to provide sufficient pre-suit notice as required by California Civil Code section  
11 1760 and California Commercial Code section 2607(3)(A). The Court disagrees.

12 Plaintiff sent pre-suit notices to defendants on June 5, 2019, via Federal Express and July  
13 9, 2019, by certified and registered mail. Plaintiff did not seek damages in the CLRA claim until  
14 the amendment of the complaint in December 2019. The letters informed Indochino of the facts  
15 underlying the claims here. Based upon the allegations of the FAC, plaintiff did not learn of the  
16 basis for his breach of contact claim until shortly before the first letter was sent. (FAC ¶ 12.) In  
17 light thereof, the FAC alleges timely and sufficient notice under these statutes.

## **B. Plausibility of Claims of Deceptive Advertising**

19 Indochino next argues that plaintiff's claims under the UCL, FAL, and CLRA are not  
20 plausible because no reasonable consumer likely would be deceived by the pricing practices  
21 plaintiff alleges; the references prices were not deceptive; and restitution is not available in this  
22 type of case. The Court addresses each argument in turn.

## 1. Reasonable Consumers Would Not Be Deceived

24 The FAC alleges that Indochino had a practice of advertising their clothing with a “sale”  
25 price adjacent to a higher, crossed-out price along with a graphic reading “Sale” or “XX% OFF”

<sup>1</sup> Defendants seek judicial notice of plaintiff's pre-suit demand letters to Indochino, referenced in the FAC, in support of their motion to dismiss. The Court **GRANTS** the unopposed request for judicial notice.

1 (FAC ¶¶ 28-35.) In addition, defendants' advertising included statements indicating the sale  
2 pricing was for a limited time, such as "April Clearance Over 100 Suits for \$299 USD (you save  
3 \$500) [¶] Last Chance on Our Limited Runs." (*Id.* ¶ 35.) Plaintiff alleges that the top banner of  
4 the homepage for Indochino's website nearly always included language that a "sale" was in  
5 progress and consumers had a limited time to obtain the clothing at the "sale" price, even though  
6 the clothing was always sold at the "sale" price. (*Id.*, ¶¶ 35-40.) Further, plaintiff alleges  
7 Indochino did not include any language to indicate to consumers that the False Reference Price  
8 was a comparison to another "substantially similar" product (such as "compare" or "compare at"),  
9 as opposed to the regular, original or former price of that same article of Clothing. (*Id.*, ¶¶ 3, 29-  
10 33, 42-43.)

11       Claims under the UCL, FAL, and CLRA concerning deceptive advertising are governed by  
12 a "reasonable consumer" standard. Under that standard, plaintiffs must plead facts showing that a  
13 "significant portion of the general consuming public or of targeted consumers, acting reasonably  
14 in the circumstances, could be misled." *Lavie v. Procter & Gamble Co.*, 105 Cal. App. 4th 496,  
15 508 (2003); *see also Freeman v. Time, Inc.*, 68 F.3d 285, 289 (9th Cir. 1995). If the court can  
16 determine from the facts alleged that no reasonable consumer would be so deceived, dismissal  
17 may be granted. *Ebner v. Fresh, Inc.*, 838 F.3d 958, 967 (9th Cir. 2016). More particularly here,  
18 under California statute, companies may not advertise a "former price of any advertised thing"  
19 unless it was "the prevailing market price . . . within three months next immediately preceding the  
20 publication of the advertisement." *See* Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17501.

21       Indochino contends that the alleged pricing practices here differ significantly from  
22 reference pricing cases in which the representations were express statements like "original price"  
23 or "compare to," and all reasonable consumers would understand that the struck-through prices  
24 were comparisons to former prices of *substantially similar* items sold by another retailer.  
25 Indochino's argument essentially seeks a ruling that, as a matter of law, no reasonable consumer  
26 would their reference prices (*i.e.* "\$799") as a comparison to the former price of that *identical*  
27 item. Plaintiff alleges in detail, with images from Indochino's advertising, the struck-through  
28 reference prices were coupled with representations of "sale," "You save \$\_\_\_\_," or a percentage

1 “off” the reference price, and had no accompanying language indicating that the reference price is  
2 one the consumer should “compare to” another item from another retailer. (FAC ¶¶ 28-39.)  
3 “[W]hether a business practice is deceptive will usually be a question of fact not appropriate for  
4 decision” on a motion to dismiss. *Williams v. Gerber Prod. Co.*, 552 F.3d 934, 938 (9th Cir.  
5 2008). The Court declines find, as a matter of law, that Indochino’s reference price  
6 representations would not mislead a reasonable consumer.

7       2.     *Basis for Deceptiveness of Reference Prices*

8       Indochino further argues that plaintiff has not alleged *why* the crossed-out reference prices  
9 are deceptive, contending that plaintiff must allege more than that the “prevailing market price”  
10 was the price at which Indochino regularly sold the clothing items. Plaintiff alleges the clothing  
11 items at issue here are all custom, “made-to-measure private label Clothing sold exclusively by”  
12 Indochino. (FAC ¶ 48; *see also* ¶¶ 5, 52, 62, 111.)<sup>2</sup> He further alleges that Indochino  
13 “manufacture[s] and distribute[s]” the clothing at issue, is “the exclusive source for” it, clothing  
14 items are labeled only with the Indochino brand name, “is not sold by any other company and is  
15 not sold at any other retail stores or websites, other than those owned and operated by” Indochino.  
16 (*Id.* ¶ 52.) Plaintiff alleges a reasonable consumer would understand the reference prices in  
17 Indochino’s advertising refer to a regular, original or former price of Indochino’s clothing, not  
18 similar items of clothing sold by a different company under a different label. (FAC at ¶¶ 2-3, 41,  
19 51, 53, 89.) Thus, the Court finds that the FAC alleges why the reference prices are deceptive.<sup>3</sup>

---

21       <sup>2</sup> Indochino’s attempt to distinguish *Spann v. J.C. Penney Corp.*, 307 F.R.D. 508 (C.D.  
22 Cal. 2015) is unavailing. The decision there was at class certification, which explains why the  
23 court relied on a significant evidentiary presentation to support plaintiff’s private label argument.  
24 Here, at the pleading stage, Freeman’s detailed allegations are sufficient.

25       <sup>3</sup> In contrast to the *Branca* decision cited by Indochino, plaintiff here has alleged “he was  
26 exposed to or relied on . . . other representations by [Indochino], such as other advertisements or  
27 marketing, that le[d] him to believe that the [reference] price was a former price at which  
28 [Indochino] sold the items.” *Branca v. Nordstrom, Inc.*, No. 14CV2062-MMA JMA, 2015 WL  
1841231, at \*7 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 20, 2015). Similar to the amended complaint in *Branca*, plaintiff  
has sufficiently alleged that the reference prices are deceptive. *See Branca v. Nordstrom, Inc.*, No.  
14CV2062-MMA (JMA), 2015 WL 10436858, at \*7 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 9, 2015) (“*Branca II*”)  
(deceptive advertising alleged where plaintiff alleged the combination of “Compare At” with “%  
Savings” led him to believe the “Compare At” price was former price of the item, or at least the  
prevailing market price, but the truth was that the item had never been sold by defendant or any  
other retailer at that price).

1                   3.     *Availability of Restitution On Consumer Fraud Claim*

2                   Indochino next argues that Freeman’s UCL and FAL claims should be dismissed because  
3 most, if not all, measures of restitution would be unavailable to him because he received some  
4 value from the underlying transaction. Arguing that “precedent in this Circuit bars Plaintiff from  
5 restitution for his consumer-fraud claims” (Motion, Dkt. No. 37, at 12:13-14), Indochino cites this  
6 Court’s decision in *Stathakos v. Columbia Sportswear Co.*, No. 15-CV-04543-YGR, 2017 WL  
7 1957063 (N.D. Cal. May 11, 2017) and another district court decision in *Chowning v. Kohl's Dep't*  
8 *Stores, Inc.*, No. CV-15-08673-RGK-SPX, 2016 WL 1072129 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 15, 2016).

9                   Indochino misrepresents the decisions in *Stathakos* and *Chowning*. Both decisions rejected  
10 plaintiffs’ particular *models* for calculating class-wide restitution at the summary judgment stage.  
11 *Stathakos*, 2017 WL 1957063 at \*9-13; *Chowning*, 2016 WL 1072129, at \*7-13(C.D. Cal. Mar.  
12 15, 2016). Neither decision purports to bar restitution under all circumstances. Trial courts have  
13 broad discretion to fashion equitable relief, based upon the parties’ evidentiary showing. *In re*  
14 *Tobacco Cases II*, 240 Cal. App. 4th 779, 792 (2015) (“difference between the price paid and  
15 actual value received is *a* measure of restitution, not the exclusive measure”); *Colgan v.*  
16 *Leatherman Tool Grp., Inc.*, 135 Cal. App. 4th 663, 700 (2006), *as modified on denial of reh'g*  
17 (Jan. 31, 2006) (amount of restitution awarded under FAL, CLRA, and UCL “must be supported  
18 by substantial evidence”).

19                   As stated above, plaintiff’s CLRA, UCL, and FAL claims are sufficiently alleged.  
20 Determination of whether plaintiff can offer a viable model for measuring restitution is premature  
21 at this point in the litigation. *See Stathakos v. Columbia Sportswear Co.*, No. 15-CV-04543-YGR,  
22 2016 WL 1730001, at \*4 (N.D. Cal. May 2, 2016) (denying motion to dismiss on identical  
23 grounds).

24                   The motion to dismiss the CLRA, UCL, and FAL claims on the foregoing grounds is,  
25 therefore, **DENIED**.

26                   C.     **Elements of Breach of Contract Claim**

27                   Indochino next argues that plaintiff’s breach of contract claim should be dismissed for the  
28 further reason that he has failed to plead the necessary factual elements, including the terms of the

1 contract, the nature of the breach, and the resulting damage. Indochino contends the allegations do  
2 not give fair notice of the basis for the claim, and that plaintiff has not alleged a plausible breach  
3 or damages.

4 The FAC alleges that plaintiff entered into a contract with defendants when he purchased  
5 clothing, subject to the defendants' terms and conditions, including those in his order  
6 confirmation. (FAC ¶ 108.) Freeman alleges that the contracts stated Indochino would provide a  
7 product that had a value equal to the reference price and failed to do so, instead providing clothing  
8 of a quality "materially less than the value of the Clothing set forth in the contracts." (FAC ¶¶ 111,  
9 114, 115.) Freeman has alleged the required elements of his breach of contract claim. *Cf.*  
10 *Munning v. Gap, Inc.*, No. 16-CV-03804-TEH, 2016 WL 6393550, at \*7 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 28, 2016)  
11 (advertised price reductions were material and supported claim for breach of contract based on  
12 allegations that plaintiffs did not receive "benefit of the bargain," *i.e.*, higher-value product at a  
13 price reduction) (citing *Hinojos v. Kohl's Corp.*, 718 F.3d 1098, 1107 (9th Cir. 2013), *as amended*  
14 *on denial of reh'g and reh'g en banc* (July 8, 2013)).<sup>4</sup>

15 Finally, Indochino's argument that "Plaintiff does not give even an estimated amount or  
16 propose any way to calculate these purported damages" (Reply, Dkt. No. 42, at 6:25-26),  
17 misunderstands plaintiff's pleading burden. Such issues are premature and not a valid basis to  
18 dismiss the breach of contract claim. The motion to dismiss on these grounds is **DENIED**.

19 **D. Equitable Relief**

20 Next, Indochino offers three reasons why Freeman's claims for equitable relief should be  
21 dismissed: (1) failure to allege legal remedies would not be adequate; (2) lack of standing for  
22 injunctive relief to address any future harm; and (3) unjust enrichment is not a claim recognized in  
23 California law. All three bases are without merit.

24 Plaintiff may allege claims in the alternative at the pleading stage. The equitable remedies

25

---

26 <sup>4</sup> Further, Indochino's attempt to distinguish *Munning*'s contract terms from those alleged  
27 here fails. As Indochino acknowledges, the basis for the contract claim in *Munning* was the  
28 allegation that "a full price that was struck through, followed by a percentage discount and the  
phrase "now \$16.99." *Munning*, 2016 WL 6393550, at \*7. Plaintiff has alleged nearly identical  
circumstances, and more. (See, e.g., FAC Exh. 1 [order confirmation stating "discount: \$450"].)

1 afforded by the UCL and CLRA are expressly stated to be in addition to other available remedies  
2 at law. *See* Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17205; Cal. Civ. Code § 1752, 1780(a).

3 With respect to injunctive relief, plaintiff alleges that, regardless of any pricing policy  
4 changes implemented by Indochino on present iteration of its website, he cannot be certain that  
5 Indochino will not revert to its prior alleged practices in the absence of injunctive relief. (FAC ¶¶  
6 60, 62, 85.) A plaintiff sufficiently alleges standing for prospective injunctive relief based upon a  
7 threat of future injury where the complaint alleges he “faces the similar injury of being unable to  
8 rely on [defendant’s] representations . . . in deciding whether or not . . . [to] purchase the product  
9 in the future.” *Davidson v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*, 889 F.3d 956, 971–72 (9th Cir.), *cert. denied*,  
10 139 S. Ct. 640 (2018). Plaintiff has done so here. Indochino is alleged to have misrepresented  
11 that it offered custom-made suits at a steep discount when in fact the suits were never sold at the  
12 higher reference price. Plaintiff plausibly alleges a continued desire to purchase custom-made  
13 clothing from Indochino in the future if it accurately represents the prevailing market value of that  
14 clothing. (FAC ¶¶ 58, 59, 60.) *Cf. Lepkowski v. CamelBak Prod., LLC*, No. 19-CV-04598-YGR,  
15 2019 WL 6771785, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 12, 2019) (finding lack of a plausible allegation that  
16 plaintiff intended to purchase water bottle from defendant in the future where she alleged she  
17 would never purchase a water bottle that was not “spillproof”).

18 With regard to unjust enrichment, Ninth Circuit law is well-settled that the claim alleged  
19 here is cognizable and not duplicative of other claims for breach of contract or restitution. *See*  
20 *Astiana v. Hain Celestial Grp., Inc.*, 783 F.3d 753, 762 (9th Cir. 2015) (“quasi-contract” cause of  
21 action based on allegations of misleading labeling and resulting unjust enrichment of defendant  
22 sufficiently alleged and not duplicative).

23 Thus, Indochino’s motion on these grounds is **DENIED**.

24 **E. Punitive Damages**

25 Finally, Indochino argues that the Court should dismiss plaintiff’s prayer for punitive  
26 damages, even while acknowledging that California Civil Code section 1780(a)(4) expressly  
27 permits such damages. Indochino argues the statute does not give plaintiff an entitlement to such  
28 damages, but instead plaintiff must offer substantial evidence to support such an award.

1           California Civil Code section 3294(a) sets the standard for an award of punitive damages  
2 on a state law claim, requiring plaintiff to show that the defendant's conduct evinces "oppression,  
3 fraud or malice." Plaintiff alleges fraudulent and misleading conduct. As with other arguments by  
4 Indochino, dismissal of plaintiff's request for punitive damages at this stage is premature and  
5 without a substantial basis. The motion on these grounds is **DENIED**.

6           **II. CONCLUSION**

7           Indochino's motion to dismiss is **DENIED** on all grounds stated.

8           Defendants shall file their answer to the FAC within 14 days of this Order.

9           An initial case management conference is hereby scheduled for **April 6, 2020, at 2:00**  
10 **p.m.** The parties shall file an updated joint case management statement **seven** days in advance of  
11 the conference.

12           This terminates Docket No. 37.

13           **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

14           Dated: March 11, 2020

---



YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28